DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 557 CE 010 523

AUTHOR Shortlidge, Richard L., Jr.; Brito, Patricia
TITLE How Women Arrange for the Care of Their Children While They Work: A Study of Child Care Arrangements, Costs, and Preferences in 1971.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Human Resource Research.
SPONS AGENCY Employment and Training Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 77
NOTE 61p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks; Caucasians; *Child Care; *Costs; Day Care Services; *Family Characteristics; Geographic Location; *Individual Characteristics; Marital Status; Policy Formation; Preschool Children; *Working Women
IDENTIFIERS United States

ABSTRACT

The analysis presented in this report was designed to make available to policymakers a comprehensive study of child care arrangements, preferences, and costs as of 1971, using data from the National Longitudinal Surveys of Women and Young Women. This analysis yields results which both complement and update the earlier Low and Spindler report titled "Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States (ED 040 738). Data is presented according to the study sample, which was divided into two racial groups--blacks and whites--which were further subdivided into three categories by the age of the woman's youngest child. (These categories are women whose youngest child was under three years of age, three to five years of age, and six to thirteen years of age, referred to in the study as infants, preschoolers, and young school-aged children, respectively.) This report is divided into four major sections. The first section explores the kinds of child care arrangements used by employed mothers. The second section examines child care expenditures. The third section analyzes the characteristics of women who prefer some form of child care other than their current arrangement. The fourth section summarizes and emphasizes the policy implications of the findings. Nineteen tables of comparative data are included. (NL)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED137557

How Women Arrange for the Care of Their Children While They Work: A Study of Child Care Arrangements, Costs, and Preferences in 1971

by

Richard L. Shortlidge, Jr.
and
Patricia Brito

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Center for Human Resource Research
College of Administrative Science
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio
January 1977

The research reported in this report is part of the National Longitudinal Surveys of labor market behavior being conducted by the Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research under contract with the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor. Since researchers undertaking such projects are encouraged to express their own judgments, interpretations or viewpoints are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

CE 010 523

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction 1

II. Type of Child Care Arrangement 3

Household Composition 5
Characteristics of the Job 9
Geographic Location of the Residence..... 11
Personal Characteristics 13
Summary 14

III. Costs of Child Care..... 16

Characteristics of the Child Care Arrangement 17
Ability to Pay 18
Concern for Child Care Quality 19
Residential and Geographic Characteristics 20
Summary 21

IV. Preference for an Alternative Form of Child Care..... 21

V. Policy Implications 22

Tables 25

LIST OF TABLES

Table number	Title	Page number
1 through 12	TYPE OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENTS	25-48
1	Unadjusted and Adjusted Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child under 3 years of age)	25
2	Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child under 3 years of age)	26
3	Unadjusted and Adjusted Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest child under 3 years of age)	29
4	Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest child under 3 years of age)	30
5	Unadjusted and Adjusted Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)	33
6	Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)	34
7	Unadjusted and Adjusted Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)	37
8	Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)	38
9	Unadjusted and Adjusted Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)	41

Table number	Title	Page number
10	Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)	42
11	Unadjusted and Adjusted Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)	45
12	Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)	46
13 through 18	COSTS OF CHILD CARE	49-54
13	Unadjusted and Adjusted Expenditures for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child under 3 years of age)	49
14	Unadjusted and Adjusted Expenditures for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest child under 3 years of age)	50
15	Unadjusted and Adjusted Expenditures for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)	51
16	Unadjusted and Adjusted Expenditures for Child Care, by Socioeconomic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest 3 to 5 years of age)	52
17	Unadjusted and Adjusted Expenditures for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (White women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)	53
18	Unadjusted and Adjusted Expenditures for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971 (Black women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)	54

Table number	Title	Page number
19	PREFERENCE FOR AN ALTERNATIVE FORM OF CHILD CARE	55
19	Preference for an Alternative form of Child Care by Race and Age of Youngest Child, 1971	55

How Women Arrange for the Care of Their Children While They Work: A Study of Child Care Arrangements, Costs, and Preferences in 1971

I INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been considerable debate about the extent to which the government should fund child care services for working mothers. The formulation of appropriate child care legislation requires accurate and detailed information about how working women currently arrange for the care of their children, about what kinds of child care arrangements women prefer, and about the relative costs of these different arrangements. However, most studies of child care have relied on limited samples from which generalizations are difficult. The major exception is Low and Spindler's Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States, which was published in 1968.[1] Although this report is based upon data from the Current Population Survey (CPS) collected in 1965, it is still frequently cited in analyses of female labor supply and child care, as well as in Congressional testimony related to national child care legislation. The

---

We wish to express appreciation to our colleagues at the Center for Human Resource Research for their thoughtful comments on an earlier version of this report. A special word of thanks is due to Herbert S. Parnes for his many valuable suggestions. We also wish to acknowledge the able computer programming assistance of Keith Stober, Jack Schrull and Ron Taylor.

[1] Seth Low and Pearl G. Spindler, Child Care Arrangements of Working Mothers in the United States. (Washington, D.C.: Children's Bureau, J.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Women's Bureau, Employment Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1968).

Low and Spindler study has endured as a valuable and relevant source of information on child care primarily because it is nationally representative and comprehensive.

The objective of this study is to make available to policy makers a comprehensive study of child care arrangements, preferences and costs as of 1971, using data from the National Longitudinal Surveys of Women and Young Women.[2] This analysis yields results which both complement and update the earlier Low and Spindler report. However, the method of analysis in this study departs from Low and Spindler's tabular approach by systematically controlling for race and the age of the youngest child. The sample is divided into two racial groups--blacks and whites--and these are further subdivided into three categories by the age of the woman's youngest child. These categories are women whose youngest child was under three years of age, three to five years of age and six to thirteen years of age. In the presentation, these three age groups are referred to as infants, preschoolers, and young school-aged children, respectively. Furthermore, Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) is used to explore the determinants of the kind of child care arrangement

---

[2]The use of the National Longitudinal Surveys of Young Women and Women for 1971 introduces some important differences between our sample and the CPS sample. First, the February 1965 Current Population Survey administered the child care questions to households which included a woman who had worked a minimum of 27 weeks in 1964 and who had a child under 14. Our sample includes women with at least one child under 14 who were employed at the time of the 1971 survey, regardless of the number of weeks they worked in the previous year. Second, the CPS represents women of all ages while the National Longitudinal Surveys of Young Women (17 to 27 years old in 1971) and Women (34 to 48 in 1971) exclude women who were 28 to 33 years of age.

used, its cost, and the woman's preference for an alternative mode of care. The multivariate analysis of child care arrangements distinguishes only between family and nonfamily sources of care. To provide greater detail, tabular analysis is also presented which shows the precise types of child care arrangements used by women with certain socioeconomic and demographic characteristics.

The study is divided into four major sections. The first explores the kinds of child care arrangements used by employed mothers. The second examines child care expenditures. The third analyzes the characteristics of women who prefer some form of child care other than their current arrangement. The fourth summarizes and emphasizes the policy implications of the findings.

II TYPE OF CHILD CARE ARRANGEMENT

Care by a member of the immediate family or by a relative accounted for a major share of all child care arrangements in 1971 made by both whites and blacks irrespective of the age of the youngest child (Tables 1 through 12). Among white women with infant or preschool children, about half used such a family arrangement. Black women were even more likely to rely upon family members. For example, 65 percent of those with infants and 60 percent of those whose youngest child was aged three to five left their children with family members while they worked. For both races, women whose youngest child was of school age depended most heavily on a family means of child care. This was the result of young school-aged children frequently being left unsupervised or in the care of an older sibling.

If a woman did employ a person outside the family to care for her children, she most often took the children to another person's home. Among those women with infants who used nonfamily child care, more than half the whites and almost two-fifths of the blacks depended on care in another's home. For both blacks and whites child care centers were more likely to be used if the youngest child was three to five years of age. Nevertheless, among whites with such children, reliance on center care was less common than care in someone else's home. On the other hand, among blacks, slightly over half of those who employed a nonfamily mode of child care used day care centers.

Since the family is the primary supplier of child care, this section focuses on the choice between family and nonfamily means of care. To maintain comparability with the earlier Low and Spindler study, we employ variables similar to theirs to describe the woman's socioeconomic and family characteristics. However, unlike Low and Spindler, we use multivariate analysis in addition to cross-tabulations.[3] Thus, we are able to measure more precisely the net effect of each of the independent variables on the choice of a child care arrangement. The dependent variable in our model assumes a value of one if the respondent uses a nonfamily means of child care and zero

---

[3]The technique employed for multivariate analysis in this report is Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA). The MCA technique permits one to calculate the mean value of the dependent variable for each category of a particular explanatory variable, "adjusted" for the effects of all other variables in the model. Differences in these adjusted proportions or means may be interpreted as the "pure" association of that variable with the dependent variable.

otherwise.[4] The MCA model is run separately for each of six universes defined by race and age of youngest child.[5]

In formulating a model of the choice of nonfamily child care, we assume that a woman's preference for the type of child care she uses is the product of her personal experiences and characteristics. The nature and extent of her need for child care services are determined by her work schedule and by the availability of other persons in the household to supervise her children. However, if the price of satisfying the family's tastes or needs for an adequate child care arrangement is too high, it becomes uneconomical for the mother to work. Hence, the final type of care employed is the result of an effort to balance tastes and needs against available child care resources subject to constraints imposed by cost. Our independent variables are intended to measure these aspects of the choice of a child care arrangement. For expository convenience, we have classified them under four headings: (1) the composition of her household; (2) the characteristics of her job; (3) the geographic location of her residence; and (4) her personal attributes.

Household Composition

If the household includes an adult sibling, aunt, uncle, or grandparent, this individual may be available to assist in the care

---

[4]If a woman used a combination of family and nonfamily child care she was classified for purposes of this analysis as a nonfamily child care user. Thus, a zero for the dependent variable means the woman relied exclusively on family members.

[5]Preliminary analysis of the data indicated that there were significant interactions among race, the age of the youngest child, and the other independent variables. These results suggested that stratification by race and age of the youngest child was necessary.

of children during the mother's working hours. Since large or extended families may often arrange to share among their members the responsibilities of caring for young children, we expect the employment of nonfamily sources of care to be negatively related to the presence of such an adult relative in the household.[6]

An adult relative in the household was a significant predictor of the respondent's use of nonfamily child care for all groups of white women and for black women with infants (Tables 1, 3, 5 and 9). For these groups, as expected, women with an adult relative in the household were more likely to depend on family care. The failure of this relationship to prevail among black women whose youngest child was of preschool or school age may be explained by the tendency of these mothers to substitute care by some other family member or relative when there was no adult relative living with the family (Tables 7 and 11). For both of these groups of black women, those who had an adult relative living in the household tended to use that relative to care for the child. However, those without such a relative in the household were much more likely to take their children to a relative's home or to use a combination of family members (Tables 8 and 12).

A teenager (i.e., 14 to 17 years of age) residing in the home is a potential source of child care during nonschool hours of the day.[7]

---

[6]This independent variable assumed the value of one if there was a relative 18 years of age or older living in the household and a zero otherwise. Children of the respondent in this age group who were not attending school were classified as adult relatives, but husbands were not.

[7]This independent variable assumed the value of one if there was a child 14 to 17 years of age in the household and zero otherwise.

Therefore, we expect the presence of a teenager to affect child care arrangements among young school-aged children but not among those under the age of six, since infants and preschoolers are likely to require care during the hours that teenaged siblings are in school. As expected, the presence of a teenager was not a significant determinant of the choice of care for women with infant children (Tables 1 and 3). Among blacks and whites with children six to thirteen years of age, teenagers decreased significantly the use of nonfamily forms of care (Tables 9 and 11). The results for women whose youngest child was three to five years of age were mixed (Tables 5 and 7). Among whites, teenagers increased the reliance on family forms of child care. On the other hand, among blacks, teenagers increased the use of family and nonfamily child care combinations. Since such combinations were classified as nonfamily child care, the MCA results indicated a significant positive relationship between the presence of a teenager and utilization of nonfamily care.

Nonmarried women whose youngest child was a preschooler were significantly more likely to use nonfamily forms of child care than married women.[8] In the case of women with infants, any decrease in family care due to the absence of the father was offset by an increase in care by some other relative (Tables 2 and 4). Similarly, where the youngest child was six to thirteen greater use of care by some other relative in the home and by older siblings compensated for the loss of care by the father (Tables 10 and 12).

---

[8]The marital status variable was dichotomous, with the value of one if the woman was married and living with her husband and zero otherwise.

It was hypothesized that having two or more children in the family would reduce the probability of the respondent's depending on a source of care beyond the family. If child care expenses increase with the number of children in the family, then a woman with several children must use a cheaper means of child care than one with a single child to satisfy the same cost constraint.[9] In general, care by a family member was less expensive than nonfamily care; hence, households with more than one child were expected to be more likely than single-child families to use a family means of child care.[10] However, this hypothesis was confirmed in only one case. The number of children in the household was significant in determining the choice of family or nonfamily child care only for women whose youngest child was a preschooler (Tables 5 and 7). Furthermore, the number of children worked in different directions for black and white women. White women with more than one child were more likely to use a family means of child care; black women with more than one child were less likely to do so. The more detailed classification of child care methods found in Tables 6 and 8 may explain this racial difference. For both blacks and whites whose youngest child was three to five, an only child was more often cared for outside the home, by either a family member or someone else, than were children in households with two or more children. In single-child households, over 70 percent

---

[9]Number of children is represented by two categories: respondents with only one child zero to thirteen and those with two or more children zero to thirteen years of age.

[10]See Tables 13 through 18 for the cost of child care.

of the households regardless of race cared for their preschool child outside the home. This compared to 26 percent of the whites and 50 percent of the blacks in families with more than one child (Tables 6 and 8). For blacks, care outside the home most often meant care in a relative's home; 46 percent of the black families with only one child used this means, compared to 14 percent for black families with two or more children. For whites with a child of preschool age, care outside the home was more likely to involve a nonrelative or day care center.

Characteristics of the Job

Since a father, relative, or older sibling might be available as a child care resource for only a limited number of hours each day, we would expect that reliance on such individuals for child care would be more frequent among families in which the mother worked part time.[11] In addition, because of the shorter hours involved, mothers who work part time and have school-aged children are more likely to be able to care for their children after school. Hence, part-time workers should be less likely than full-time workers to use nonfamily child care arrangements. These expectations were confirmed only for white women whose youngest was less than three or six to thirteen years of age (Tables 1 and 9). White part-time workers with infants were much more likely to rely on care by fathers than were full-time workers, while those employed full time more often used care in the home of nonrelatives (Table 2). For white women with school-aged children, part-time work

---

[11] A part-time worker is defined as one who usually worked a maximum of 34 hours a week.

was associated with increased care by the mother after school hours, increased care by the mother at work, and a decrease in the number of children left unattended (Table 10).

In general, arranging for a child to be cared for by a nonrelative or a day care center was more expensive than an arrangement made with a family member. Thus, we anticipate that reliance on nonfamily child care should be directly related to a woman's hourly earnings. For white women with infants or preschoolers this relationship was found to exist (Tables 1 and 5).[12] This resulted primarily from an increase in the care given by nonrelatives rather than a significantly greater reliance on center care (Tables 2 and 6). For example, among white women with infants, the most highly paid group was twice as likely as the lowest to use care by nonrelatives either in or out of the home.

For blacks, the results were unclear. The mother's hourly wage rate was significantly related to the use of a nonfamily child care arrangement for families whose youngest child was of preschool or school age (Tables 7 and 11). However, for the first group the relationship was not monotonic; and for the second, it was opposite the one predicted. Thus, for both groups, respondents in the lowest wage category were more likely than those in the middle category ($1.61 to $2.40) to make child care arrangements outside the family. However, this finding is ambiguous, since for both groups of blacks for which the variable was

---

[12] Respondents are divided into three categories by hourly wage. The lowest paid are those earning $1.60 an hour or less, the minimum wage in 1971. In the second category are those earning $1.61 to $2.40 an hour, and the highest paid are those making over $2.40.

significant, those earning $1.60 or less an hour were much more likely to use a combination of relatives and nonrelatives (Tables 8 and 12). It will be recalled that such cases were classified as nonfamily arrangements. Among black women with preschool children, the higher-than-average use of nonfamily care by those respondents earning $2.40 or more an hour was the result of a greater reliance on organized day care centers (Table 8). The proportion using day care centers was almost twice as great for the most highly paid group as for those earning under $1.60.

Geographic Location of Residence

The location of a woman's home is expected to influence the child care options available to her. For example, the greater the population density, the higher is the probability of having a day care center nearby.[13] Historically, the western region of the country, particularly California, has led the nation in the development of organized day care centers and other preschool programs.[14] In addition, federally sponsored child care programs have been concentrated in the southern United States. Thus, we expect to find a higher use of nonfamily forms of child care, particularly center care, in the South and the West.

---

[13]A three category variable was used as a proxy for the population density of the woman's area of residence. The categories of this variable were (1) living in the central city of an SMSA, (2) living in an SMSA but not its central city, and (3) not living in an SMSA. Thus, it is assumed that population density decreases from category one to category three.

[14]For preprimary enrollment rates by region for 1971, see Linda A. Barker, Preprimary Enrollment: October 1971 (Washington: National Center for Educational Statistics, HE 5,220:20079-72). For a discussion of the history of child care in the United States, see Virginia Kerr, "One Step Forward--Two Steps Back: Child Care's Long American History," in Pamela Roby (ed.), Child Care--Who Cares (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1973) pp. 157-71.

Population density was significantly related to the choice between family and nonfamily forms of care only among black women with children under six (Tables 3 and 7). Living outside an SMSA significantly reduced the probability that a black child would be cared for in a nonfamily arrangement while his or her mother worked outside the home.

Although the relationship between population density and frequency of nonfamily child care arrangements was not significant for whites, there was an important association between population density and reliance on organized day care centers. For both blacks and whites whose youngest child was a preschooler, the proportion sending their children to a day care center was considerably higher if the family lived in the central city of an SMSA (Tables 6 and 8). For example, 23 percent of the whites and 22 percent of the blacks who lived in central cities of SMSA's used center care. This compared with 8 percent of the whites and 13 percent of the blacks who lived outside an SMSA.

Region of residence had a significant effect on the selection of nonfamily child care arrangements among whites with infant children (Table 1). For this group of mothers, use of nonfamily forms of care was significantly greater in the South than in other regions of the country--primarily because of the higher-than-average use of center care by southern whites (Table 2).

An examination of regional patterns of day care center use indicates that white women who live in either the southern or western regions were considerably more likely to leave a child under six in a day care center while they worked.[15] For blacks a similar relationship is found

---

[15]Women whose youngest child was six to thirteen were an exception to this statement.

among women with infants; 13 percent of those in the South used day care centers compared to only 2 percent in the Northeast or North Central states (Table 4). Whether these differences result from regional differences in the emphasis of federal programs or from variations among states in child care legislation is not known, but deserves careful investigation.

Personal Characteristics[16]

Arleen Leibowitz's research on the time devoted by mothers and fathers to the nurturing of young children suggests a positive correlation between the mother's educational attainment and the amount of time spent in the care of children under six years of age.[17] Furthermore, she suggests that better educated women are unlikely to view older children or other relatives as adequate sources of child care for young children. Thus, we hypothesized that the greater a woman's educational attainment, the more likely she will be to use a nonfamily form of child care.

Our results for white women whose youngest child was either an infant or preschooler confirmed our hypothesis (Tables 1 and 5). On the other hand, for blacks the relationship held only in the case of

---

[16]The analysis included two variables which we classified as personal characteristics. These were age and educational attainment. The results for the age variable were perplexing and appeared to be related to our classification of a combination of relative and nonrelative care as a nonfamily child care arrangement. For this reason, we do not discuss the age variable in the text.

[17]See Arleen Leibowitz, "Education and Home Production," American Economic Review 64 (May 1974): 243-50; and Arleen Leibowitz, "Home Investments in Children," Journal of Political Economy 82 (March/April 1974):S111-31.

women with infants (Table 3). All else being equal, white and black women with at least some college education were approximately one and one-half times as likely to leave an infant child in a nonfamily child care arrangement as were women who had not completed high school (Tables 1 and 3). For whites, this results mainly from more frequent use of unrelated persons who came into the home to care for the children or who cared for the children in their own homes (Table 2). For blacks, it was the higher use of day care centers among those with some college education that explained this difference (Table 4).

Although education was not significantly related to the choice between family and nonfamily means of care for those households where the youngest child was six to thirteen, there appears to be an important relationship between education and type of family care (Tables 9 and 11). Among both races, women with more than a high school education seem better able to arrange their working days to provide care for their children themselves. Whites with more than 12 years of schooling whose youngest child was in school were more frequently available to care for their children after school than were women with a high school education or less, and there was correspondingly less reliance on care by older siblings among the most highly educated group (Table 10). Those blacks with more than a high school education had a lower probability of leaving a child unsupervised or in the care of a sibling and a greater probability of care by the mother herself at work or at home after school (Table 12).

Summary

In general, the decision to go outside the family to arrange for the care of young children while the mother worked was a function of the

availability of other family members at home or in the community, the woman's earnings, and her educational attainment. If relatives lived in the home or local area, the working mother was likely to have them look after the children in her absence. Although teenaged children often cared for preschoolers and young school-aged children, they were generally not used to care for children under three years of age. In addition to the family's composition, the earnings of the woman played an important role in the choice of nonfamily forms of child care. Thus, all else being equal, reliance on nonfamily child care increased as earnings increased. After controlling for family composition and earnings, educational attainment was positively related to the selection of nonfamily child care, particularly among women with infants. Thus, women with some college education were more likely than those with less than high school to opt for a nonfamily form of child care even if family substitutes were available in the home or locality.

Federal child care legislation has had as one of its primary objectives the provision of child care services to low income families. With the national emphasis on the development of center care, we expected to observe the effect of this policy in a high incidence of day care center utilization among women who earned low wages. Our results for whites suggested that low wage women were no more likely to rely on center care than high wage women; and for blacks, there was a positive relationship between reliance on day care centers and the average hourly earnings of women.

III COSTS OF CHILD CARE

Engaging in market activities outside the home involves direct as well as indirect costs which affect the net returns from work. For women with small children, such costs include those occasioned by the care of children. The greater these costs, the lower is the net monetary benefit from work. Thus, a meaningful way to measure the cost of child care for the family is the direct cash outlay associated with an hour of market work supplied by the mother.[18] In this section, we analyze the factors that explain variation in this amount.

Our cost model hypothesizes that child care expenditures are a function of the kind of child care arranged, the ability of the family

---

[18] Note that we are not examining the average hourly cost of child care. (NLS data do not permit an estimate of that value, since information was not collected on actual number of hours covered by a child care arrangement if the woman paid for child care by the day, week, month or year.) A mother may actually pay for fewer hours of child care than the actual number of hours that she worked. For example, assume that there are two working mothers. Each relies upon 20 hours of child care per week and pays $.50 per hour for her arrangement. Furthermore, they both earn $2.00 an hour. However, the first mother works a regular 40-hour-a-week job while the second works only 20 hours. The net hourly earnings of the first mother are higher than the second's, since her expenditures of child care are spread over more hours of work. Thus, while the first mother nets $1.75 per hour, the second receives $1.50.

The first mother may rely on unpaid family members for 20 additional hours of child care to cover her time away from home. Our procedure assumes a zero cost for the time of these individuals. Obviously, the assigning of a zero cost to such family members implies that their marginal product in their next best alternative is zero. Although we fully acknowledge that these family resources may involve indirect costs to the family, we have no practical way of attaching a value to their time devoted to the care of children. The valuation of these family resources is complex since family members may enjoy looking after the children and may simultaneously engage in other household tasks. Thus, the indirect cost to the family is far from obvious. For this reason, we feel that a more meaningful and practical method is one that accounts for only the direct monetary outlay for child care.

to pay for it, concern for child care quality, and residential and geographic characteristics. As in the analysis of child care arrangements, we have stratified our sample by race and by the age of the youngest child. Similarly, the statistical method of analysis is Multiple Classification Analysis. Thus, we are able to determine the net or "pure" effect of any particular independent variable, after adjusting for the effects of the other independent variables in the equation.

The cost of child care associated with an hour of market work varied inversely with the age of the youngest child. For example, black and white women with infants paid an average of about $.37 for child care for each hour that they worked outside the home (Tables 13 and 14). If the youngest child was a preschooler, the average hourly expenditure was $.26 for whites and $.28 for blacks (Tables 15 and 16). For school-age children, the corresponding figures were $.06 and $.04 (Tables 17 and 18).

Characteristics of the Child Care Arrangement

Expenditures for child care are likely to be affected by who cares for the children, the number of children involved, and the number of hours of care to be provided. Four variables were included in the analysis to measure these effects: (1) the type and location of the arrangement used; (2) the number of children under 14 years of age living in the home; (3) marital status; and (4) the number of hours worked per week.

The single most important factor affecting the cost of child care was the type and location of care (Tables 13 through 18). Family arrangements in the child's own home were less expensive than those

in the homes of relatives. For example, white women with infant children paid an average of $.07 per hour worked for family care in their own homes compared with $.40 per hour worked for care in the homes of relatives (Table 13). This cost difference reflected the fact that in-home family care was less likely than care in the homes of relatives to involve an exchange of money. Compared to both family forms of care, nonfamily care was more expensive, averaging over $.50 per hour (Table 13).

After controlling for the type of arrangement as well as the other independent variables in the model, the cost of child care was generally not influenced by the number of children for whom care was provided. The exception to this statement was white women with infant children. For these women, hourly child care expenditures increased as the number of children under 14 years old rose (Table 13).

For both white and black women whose youngest child was a preschooler, the average cost of child care was higher among nonmarried than married women (Tables 15 and 16). Among whites, the respective amounts were $.32 and $.25. For blacks, they were $.46 and $.13. Thus, controlling for the kind of arrangement and the hours worked by the woman, the net return from an hour of work for women with the same wage was lower for nonmarried than married women whose youngest child was a preschooler. A similar conclusion was reached in the case of women with infant children. In this case, nonmarried mothers paid $.68 per hour worked compared to $.18 for married mothers.

Ability to Pay

Women who earn more may be expected to pay more for child care. In simple cross-tabulations not presented in this report, we found that

working mothers with children under six on average spent between one-sixth and one-fifth of their hourly earnings for the care of their children. This relative expenditure remained remarkably stable regardless of earnings, implying a direct relationship between earnings and the absolute expenditures for child care. In the multivariate analysis, a significant direct relationship between earnings and expenditures on child care was found for white women whose youngest child was under six and for black women whose youngest child was six to thirteen (Tables 13, 15 and 18).

Concern for Child Care Quality

Recent time-budget studies have indicated that better educated women spend more time than less well educated women in the care of infants and preschoolers.[19] These findings suggest a positive correlation between concern for child care quality and a mother's educational attainment. Since we include the mother's hourly earnings and her choice of a child care arrangement in our MCA's, we rely upon her educational attainment to serve as a proxy for interest in child care quality. Therefore, we assume a direct relationship between educational attainment and expenditure.

After controlling for her earnings and the type of child care arrangement used, a mother's educational attainment was not significantly related to child care expenditures. However, since education was important in the selection of a child care arrangement, we conclude that its primary effect was on the choice of an arrangement rather than the

---

[19]Russell C. Hill and Frank P. Stafford, "Allocation of Time to Preschool Children and Educational Opportunity," Journal of Human Resources 9 (Summer 1974): 323-41; and Leibowitz, "Education and Home Production."

amount expended for it once the arrangement had been determined. Thus, whereas better educated women were more likely to select a nonfamily form of child care than were less educated women, they paid no more for such child care than did women with less education who used the same arrangement.

Residential and Geographic Characteristics

The price paid for any form of child care may be expected to be influenced by geographic differences in supply, demand, and tastes for child care. Thus, we have included measures of population density and region of residence. The net effect of residing in an urban or rural area on the cost of child care is not a priori predictable, since both the supply of and demand for child care are likely to be greater in densely populated urban areas. Regionally, nonfamily child care utilization tends to be higher in the South and the West than other parts of the country. Such differences may be expected to influence regional cost variations.

Living in an urban area significantly reduced the average cost of child care among black and white mothers with infant children and for blacks whose youngest child was a preschooler (Tables 13, 14 and 16). The difference was particularly dramatic among blacks with infants (Table 14). If a black woman with an infant child lived in the central city of an SMSA, she paid on average $.15 per hour for child care for each hour that she worked. However, if this same woman did not reside in an SMSA, she paid on average $.75 per hour or five times the rate of her urban counterpart (Table 14).

Summary

The inverse relationship between the cost of child care and the age of the youngest child may help to explain the negative association between young children and the labor force participation of women. All else being equal, a woman with a young child can anticipate a lower monetary return from work than one with an older child.

The primary factor which affected the cost of child care was the kind of arrangement actually made. If a child was cared for in the home by a member of the immediate family, the cost was lower than if he or she were cared for in the home of a relative, friend, or neighbor. However, the most expensive mode of child care was in-home care by someone unrelated to the family. Thus, all else being equal, the net return from market work appears higher among women who relied upon family forms of child care.

Furthermore, both earnings and rural residence played an important role in how much a woman paid for the care of her children. Women who earned more tended to pay more for child care. In addition, working mothers residing in areas of low population density paid more on average for child care than those living in areas of high population density.

IV PREFERENCE FOR AN ALTERNATIVE FORM OF CHILD CARE

We analyzed the determinants of a mother's preference for a form of child care other than her current arrangement. Our objective was to use this analysis as a proxy for child care dissatisfaction. The independent variables in the Multiple Classification Analysis of preference were the same as those used in the cost equations. The dependent variable was dichotomous and assumed the value of one if the

woman wished to have some kind of child care other than her current arrangement and zero otherwise. However, in most cases the equations failed to achieve statistical significance. Furthermore, there were no consistent and generalizable relationships among the various independent variables and the universes stratified by race and by the age of the youngest child. Thus, these equations are not presented in the text.

Although the multivariate analysis of preference proved to be unsatisfactory from a statistical point of view, we were able to draw two conclusions from the analysis. First, most working mothers were satisfied with their child care arrangement; however, the least satisfied were mothers of infant children (Table 19). Of the women whose youngest child was under three, 16 percent of the whites and 18 percent of the blacks expressed a desire to have a different child care arrangement. The proportions declined considerably the older the youngest child in the household. Second, if the woman wished to change her child care arrangement, her preference was more likely to be for nonfamily rather than family forms of child care. This preference for nonfamily child care was stronger among blacks than whites.

V POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The cost of arranging for the care of children while the mother worked outside the home was not inconsequential in 1971. Women whose youngest child was under three spent on average $.37 for each hour that they supplied to the labor market. The cost declined to $.27 per hour among women whose youngest child was three to five. A major reduction in child care expenditures occurred once the youngest child reached school

age. In relative terms, women with children under six spent between one-sixth and one-fifth of their average hourly earnings for child care. These expenses coupled with the low wages historically earned by women in the United States may explain the inverse relationship between female labor force participation and young children. Although a family may need additional sources of income, the cost of caring for young children substantially reduces the expected gain to the family from the mother's employment outside the home.

Family members in the home and those residing nearby are the major sources of child care regardless of race and the child's age. Although care provided by family members, particularly those in the home, was less likely than nonfamily care to involve a direct cost to the family, these expenditures were significant, particularly among preschoolers and infants.

Recent modifications in the Internal Revenue Service Code represent a major step in overcoming the constraining effect of children on female labor force participation. First, part-time working mothers are now eligible for a child care deduction. Second, families may deduct child care expenditures from their taxable income even if they do not itemize deductions. Third, the tax deduction applies even if payment is made to near relatives. This liberalization of the tax code governing child care deductions should substantially affect the child care burden of low and middle income families who were not eligible in the past because the mother worked part time, the family did not itemize deductions, or the child was cared for by a near relative.

Although considerable national attention has been directed at the need for organized day care centers in order to improve the economic status of women, the results of this study suggest that the economic position of women in general is more likely to be affected by tax reforms such as those recently passed rather than the funding of day care centers. However, there are several important characteristics of center care utilization and need which require national attention. The first is the importance of day care centers among blacks. The reasons for this are unclear and deserve additional research. The second is the regional variations in day care center utilization observed in this study. Women in the Northeast and the North Central regions were considerably less likely than those in the southern or western regions to leave their children in a day care center. Thus, national policy should direct attention at these regional disparities to the extent they indicate differential access to center care among low income families residing in these various regions of the United States.

Given the substantially higher expenditures for child care among rural women, it is unlikely that their economic status will be significantly enhanced by either recent changes in the income tax code or the national and state emphasis on the development of day care centers in urban communities. Therefore, national and state policy makers should direct their attention to the child care needs of rural women in America.

Table 1 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child under 3 years of age)[b]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted percent	Adjusted[a] percent
Total or average (4.28***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.17	226	51.5	51.5
Age (2.28)			
17-27	197	50.5	49.7
34-48	29	57.7	63.2
Number of children under 14 years (0.75)			
1	128	50.1	49.2
2 or more	98	53.3	54.5
Relative 18 years or older (7.71***)			
No	198	55.4	54.7
Yes	28	24.0	29.3
Child 14-17 years old in household (0.59)			
No	212	51.3	52.1
Yes	14	c	c
Marital status (0.00)			
Married	196	52.5	51.5
Other	30	45.4	51.6
Highest grade completed (2.49*)			
0-11 years	50	42.1	41.9
12 years	124	49.2	50.8
13 or more years	52	65.3	62.0
Hours worked per week (25.33***)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	72	30.8	30.2
Full-time (35 or more hours)	154	62.1	62.4
Average hourly earnings (4.59**)			
$1.60 or less	34	40.6	48.0
$1.61-$2.40	92	41.4	41.3
$2.41 or more	100	63.4	61.1
Area of residence (0.23)			
In SMSA, central city	60	52.6	50.6
In SMSA, not central city	76	52.6	54.1
Not in SMSA	90	49.5	49.4
Region of residence (3.51**)			
South	82	63.3	62.7
West	39	51.7	50.7
Other	105	43.8	44.6

a Percentages are adjusted for the effects of all the explanatory variables shown in the table.

b Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.

c Percentages not shown where number of sample size is smaller than 25.

* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.

** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.

*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 2 Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child under 3 years of age)[a]

(Percentage distribution)

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Age		Number of children under 14 years		Relative 18 years or older	
		17-27	34-48	1	2 or more	No	Yes
Total number in sample	226	197	29	128	98	198	28
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	49	50	42	50	47	45	76
In child's home	26	25	32	25	27	22	56
Father	13	13	11	12	13	14	4
Older sibling	2	0	18	1	4	1	11
Other relative	8	9	0	11	5	3	41
Mother after school[c]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combination of family members	3	2	3	2	3	3	0
Child cares for self	0	1	0	0	1	1	0
Outside child's home	23	25	11	25	20	23	20
Home of relative	20	22	7	23	16	20	16
Mother at work	3	3	3	2	4	3	4
Nonfamily sources of care	52	51	58	50	53	55	24
In child's home	12	10	25	8	18	13	8
Nonrelative	8	8	9	8	9	9	4
Relative and nonrelative	4	2	16	0	8	4	4
Outside child's home	35	36	29	42	28	38	16
Nonrelative	29	31	22	36	21	33	7
Day care center	6	6	8	6	6	6	9
Other	4	4	3	1	8	5	0

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 2 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Child 14-17 years old in household		Marital status		Highest grade completed			Hours worked per week	
		No	Yes	Married	Other	0-11	12	13-18	Full time	Part time
Total number in sample	226	212	14	196	30	50	124	52	154	72
Total percent	100	100	b	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	49	49	b	48	55	58	51	35	38	69
In child's home	26	25	b	25	32	35	23	23	18	41
Father	13	12	b	15	0	9	12	17	7	24
Older sibling	2	1	b	3	0	9	1	0	2	3
Other relative	8	9	b	5	28	15	8	3	8	8
Mother after school[c]	0	0	b	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combination of family members	3	3	b	2	4	3	3	2	1	6
Child cares for self	0	0	b	1	0	0	0	2	1	0
Outside child's home	23	24	b	23	23	23	28	11	20	28
Home of relative	20	21	b	19	23	19	25	9	19	22
Mother at work	3	3	b	4	0	4	3	2	1	6
Nonfamily sources of care	52	51	b	53	45	42	49	65	62	31
In child's home	12	11	b	12	14	14	9	17	12	12
Nonrelative	8	8	b	9	4	9	5	17	8	9
Relative and nonrelative	4	3	b	2	11	5	5	0	4	3
Outside child's home	35	36	b	37	28	29	35	42	46	15
Nonrelative	29	30	b	30	24	20	30	35	39	10
Day care center	6	6	b	6	4	8	5	7	7	5
Other	4	4	b	4	3	0	4	7	4	4

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 2 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Average hourly earnings			Area of residence			Region of residence		
		$1.60 or less	$1.61-$2.40	$2.41 or more	In SMSA central city	In SMSA not central city	Not in SMSA	South	West	Other
Total number in sample	226	34	92	100	60	76	90	82	39	105
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	49	59	59	37	47	47	51	37	48	56
In child's home	26	31	32	19	22	29	26	14	25	34
Father	13	6	16	11	13	13	12	4	12	18
Older sibling	2	10	2	0	2	1	4	0	0	5
Other relative	8	12	10	5	7	10	7	8	8	8
Mother after school[c]	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Combination of family members	3	0	4	2	0	3	4	2	3	3
Child cares for self	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
Outside child's home	23	29	26	18	26	19	25	23	23	23
Home of relative	20	15	25	17	21	16	22	23	18	18
Mother at work	3	13	1	1	4	3	2	0	5	4
Nonfamily sources of care	52	41	41	63	53	53	50	63	52	44
In child's home	12	10	7	17	11	11	14	11	9	14
Nonrelative	8	6	4	13	7	7	11	9	6	9
Relative and nonrelative	4	3	3	4	4	4	3	2	3	5
Outside child's home	35	27	34	40	40	37	31	51	35	26
Nonrelative	29	17	28	34	27	31	29	34	32	26
Day care center	6	10	5	6	13	5	2	17	4	0
Other	4	4	1	6	2	5	4	1	8	4

a Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the preceding MCA (Table 1) are excluded from the sample.

b Percentage distribution not shown where sample size is less than 25.

c Mother works only when child is in school.

Table 3 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child under 3 years of age)[b]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted percent	Adjusted[a] percent
Total or average (3.61***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.15	207	35.0	35.0
Age (6.77***)			
17-27	174	33.0	31.9
34-48	33	48.0	55.0
Number of children under 14 years (0.86)			
1	88	30.0	31.8
2 or more	119	38.8	37.5
Relative 18 years or older (16.85***)			
No	125	46.5	45.1
Yes	82	17.0	19.3
Child 14-17 years old in household (0.27)			
No	180	34.3	35.6
Yes	27	41.0	30.5
Marital status (2.49)			
Married	125	37.1	31.2
Other	82	31.7	41.1
Highest grade completed (2.44*)			
0-11 years	84	25.9	28.7
12 years	92	36.0	35.2
13 or more years	31	53.5	49.3
Hours worked per week (1.63)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	46	25.1	27.7
Full-time (35 or more hours)	161	37.9	37.1
Average hourly earnings (0.89)			
$1.60 or less	62	29.2	33.7
$1.61-$2.40	100	36.0	38.6
$2.41 or more	45	39.0	28.5
Area of residence (7.47***)			
In SMSA, central city	104	45.2	43.4
In SMSA, not central city	39	42.0	41.3
Not in SMSA	64	13.8	17.2
Region of residence (0.27)			
South	143	31.9	34.8
West	13	c	c
Other	51	37.9	33.2

a Percentages are adjusted for the effects of all the explanatory variables shown in the table.

b Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.

c Percentages not shown where number of sample size is smaller than 25.

* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.

** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.

*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 4 Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child under 3 years of age)[a]

(Percentage distribution)

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Age		Number of children under 14 years		Relative 18 years or older	
		17-27	34-48	1	2 or more	No	Yes
Total number in sample	207	174	33	88	119	125	82
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	65	67	52	70	61	54	83
In child's home	36	34	45	38	34	19	63
Father	7	7	8	9	6	7	8
Older sibling	3	1	13	1	5	1	7
Other relative	21	22	15	24	19	7	42
Mother after school[c]	0	0	2	0	1	0	1
Combination of family members	5	4	7	5	4	4	6
Child cares for self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outside child's home	29	33	7	32	28	35	21
Home of relative	28	32	7	31	26	34	19
Mother at work	1	1	0	1	1	1	2
Nonfamily sources of care	35	33	48	30	39	47	17
In child's home	9	7	21	6	11	12	4
Nonrelative	4	2	16	5	3	5	1
Relative and nonrelative	5	5	5	1	8	7	3
Outside child's home	25	26	22	24	26	33	13
Nonrelative	15	15	13	21	10	17	11
Day care center	11	11	9	4	16	16	2
Other	1	0	5	0	2	2	0

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 4 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Child 14-17 years old in household		Marital status		Highest grade completed			Hours worked per week	
		No	Yes	Married	Other	0-11	12	13-18	Full time	Part time
Total number in sample	207	180	27	125	82	84	92	31	161	46
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	65	66	59	63	68	74	64	47	62	75
In child's home	36	34	50	28	49	43	32	32	30	56
Father	7	7	10	9	4	6	9	5	4	20
Older sibling	3	1	17	4	2	6	1	3	3	3
Other relative	21	21	16	11	37	22	20	19	18	29
Mother after school[c]	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
Combination of family members	5	4	7	4	5	9	2	5	5	3
Child cares for self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outside child's home	29	32	9	35	20	32	32	14	32	19
Home of relative	28	31	9	35	18	31	32	12	31	17
Mother at work	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	3	1	2
Nonfamily sources of care	35	34	41	37	32	26	36	54	38	25
In child's home	9	8	13	12	5	13	4	15	8	11
Nonrelative	4	4	4	4	2	1	3	12	3	7
Relative and nonrelative	5	5	9	7	2	11	2	3	6	4
Outside child's home	25	25	25	24	27	12	32	37	29	13
Nonrelative	15	14	17	12	19	9	19	13	16	11
Day care center	11	11	9	12	8	3	12	24	13	2
Other	1	1	3	2	0	2	0	2	1	2

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 4 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Average hourly earnings			Area of residence			Region of residence		
		$1.60 or less	$1.61-$2.40	$2.41 or more	In SMSA central city	In SMSA not central city	Not in SMSA	South	West	Other
Total number in sample	207	62	100	45	104	39	64	143	13	51
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	b	100
Family sources of care	65	71	64	61	55	58	86	68	b	62
In child's home	36	41	38	26	29	38	46	38	b	39
Father	7	7	9	4	5	14	7	8	b	7
Older sibling	3	4	3	2	2	0	6	3	b	3
Other relative	21	23	22	15	21	22	20	21	b	25
Mother after school[c]	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	b	0
Combination of family members	5	5	4	5	1	2	13	6	b	3
Child cares for self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	b	0
Outside child's home	29	30	27	35	26	20	40	30	b	24
Home of relative	28	29	27	32	24	20	40	29	b	22
Mother at work	1	2	0	3	2	0	0	1	b	1
Nonfamily sources of care	35	29	36	39	45	42	14	32	b	38
In child's home	9	9	6	16	13	5	4	6	b	19
Nonrelative	4	0	2	12	6	0	3	2	b	10
Relative and nonrelative	5	9	4	4	8	5	1	4	b	9
Outside child's home	25	19	30	22	31	36	10	25	b	19
Nonrelative	15	15	15	13	15	22	9	12	b	18
Day care center	11	4	14	9	15	14	1	13	b	2
Other	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	b	0

a Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the preceding MCA (Table 3) are excluded from the sample.

b Percentage distribution not shown where sample size is less than 25.

c Mother works only when child is in school.

Table 5 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)[b]

MCA results (F-ratio in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted percent	Adjusted[a] percent
Total or average (2.57***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.09	210	49.9	49.9
Age (9.25***)			
17-27	106	49.6	39.6
34-48	104	50.2	59.7
Number of children under 14 years (8.35***)			
1	79	63.5	62.3
2 or more	131	41.9	42.6
Relative 18 years or older (3.55*)			
No	182	51.8	52.4
Yes	28	38.1	34.4
Child 14-17 years old in household (2.91*)			
No	166	52.9	52.9
Yes	44	39.1	39.3
Marital status (3.60*)			
Married	171	47.2	46.8
Other	39	60.7	62.5
Highest grade completed (2.41*)			
0-11 years	60	33.0	38.5
12 years	116	54.5	53.5
13 or more years	34	63.7	57.2
Hours worked per week (0.02)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	66	50.6	50.6
Full-time (35 or more hours)	144	49.5	49.5
Average hourly earnings (3.36**)			
$1.60 or less	22	31.2	36.0
$1.61-$2.40	88	41.2	43.4
$2.41 or more	100	61.4	58.5
Area of residence (0.14)			
In SMSA, central city	49	51.2	50.4
In SMSA, not central city	68	52.4	47.6
Not in SMSA	93	47.3	51.4
Region of residence (0.99)			
South	71	51.4	54.7
West	46	57.2	53.5
Other	93	45.3	44.9

a Percentages are adjusted for the effects of all the explanatory variables shown in the table.

b Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.

* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.

** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.

*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 6 Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)[a]

(Percentage distribution)

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Age		Number of children under 14 years		Relative 18 years or older	
		17-27	34-48	1	2 or more	No	Yes
Total number in sample	210	106	104	79	131	182	28
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	50	50	50	37	58	48	62
In child's home	36	29	43	20	46	33	54
Father	13	10	16	6	18	13	15
Older sibling	3	0	6	0	5	4	0
Other relative	10	12	8	10	10	6	35
Mother after school[c]	2	2	2	1	2	2	0
Combination of family members	8	5	10	3	10	8	4
Child cares for self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outside child's home	14	21	7	17	13	15	8
Home of relative	11	16	5	12	10	12	4
Mother at work	4	5	2	5	2	3	4
Nonfamily sources of care	50	50	50	64	42	52	38
In child's home	13	9	18	4	19	14	9
Nonrelative	7	6	9	4	9	8	4
Relative and nonrelative	6	4	9	0	10	7	4
Outside child's home	31	37	26	56	16	31	29
Nonrelative	19	25	14	31	12	20	15
Day care center	12	12	12	25	4	12	15
Other	6	4	7	3	7	6	0

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 6 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Child 14-17 years old in household		Marital status		Highest grade completed			Hours worked per week	
		No	Yes	Married	Other	0-11	12	13-18	Full time	Part time
Total number in sample	210	166	44	171	39	60	116	34	144	66
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	50	47	61	53	39	67	46	36	51	49
In child's home	36	30	56	39	26	48	32	30	37	35
Father	13	11	21	17	0	17	12	10	12	16
Older sibling	3	1	13	4	2	5	3	0	3	4
Other relative	10	11	5	8	19	11	8	16	12	6
Mother after school[c]	2	3	0	3	0	0	4	0	2	3
Combination of family members	8	5	17	8	5	15	5	5	9	5
Child cares for self	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outside child's home	14	17	5	14	14	19	14	6	14	15
Home of relative	11	13	2	11	8	16	10	3	12	7
Mother at work	4	4	3	3	6	4	3	3	2	8
Nonfamily sources of care	50	53	39	47	61	33	55	64	50	51
In child's home	13	13	14	13	14	10	12	24	11	18
Nonrelative	7	7	8	7	8	4	7	13	5	11
Relative and nonrelative	6	6	7	6	6	6	5	11	6	7
Outside child's home	31	36	15	27	47	20	37	30	34	24
Nonrelative	19	23	7	17	28	14	21	22	21	16
Day care center	12	13	8	10	18	6	16	8	14	8
Other	6	4	10	7	0	3	6	10	4	8

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 6 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Average hourly earnings			Area of residence			Region of residence		
		$1.60 or less	$1.61-$2.40	$2.41 or more	In SMSA central city	In SMSA not central city	Not in SMSA	[illegible]ch	West	Other
Total number in sample	210	22	88	100	49	68	93	71	46	93
Total percent	100	b	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	50	b	59	39	49	48	53	49	43	55
In child's home	36	b	45	27	34	36	37	30	31	42
Father	13	b	16	11	7	16	15	6	7	21
Older sibling	3	b	8	0	5	2	4	0	8	3
Other relative	10	b	11	9	17	6	9	12	9	9
Mother after school[c]	2	b	1	0	0	5	1	3	2	1
Combination of family members	8	b	9	7	5	7	9	9	6	8
Child cares for self	0	b	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Outside child's home	14	b	14	12	15	12	15	19	12	12
Home of relative	11	b	13	9	8	6	15	12	8	11
Mother at work	4	b	1	3	7	6	0	7	4	1
Nonfamily sources of care	50	b	41	61	51	52	47	51	57	45
In child's home	13	b	9	18	8	17	13	10	13	16
Nonrelative	7	b	4	10	2	11	7	2	8	10
Relative and nonrelative	6	b	5	8	5	6	7	7	6	6
Outside child's home	31	b	27	37	39	32	26	36	39	24
Nonrelative	19	b	14	24	16	22	18	17	24	18
Day care center	12	b	13	13	23	10	8	19	15	6
Other	6	b	5	7	5	3	8	6	5	6

a Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the preceding MCA (Table 5) are excluded from the sample.

b Percentage distribution not shown where sample size is less than 25.

c Mother works only when child is in school.

Table 7 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)[b]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristics	Number of respondents	Unadjusted percent	Adjusted[a] percent
Total or average (1.85**)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.09	125	40.6	40.6
Age (2.94*)			
17-27	63	37.4	46.8
34-48	62	44.8	32.2
Number of children under 14 years (9.50***)			
1	41	31.2	22.2
2 or more	34	45.2	49.7
Relative 18 years or older (0.04)			
No	83	39.2	40.0
Yes	42	43.4	41.8
Child 14-17 years old in household (9.74***)			
No	87	36.5	32.2
Yes	38	50.5	61.2
Marital status (3.28*)			
Married	77	34.6	33.6
Other	48	47.7	48.9
Highest grade completed (0.39)			
0-11 years	68	37.5	37.8
12 years	42	47.2	45.9
13 or more years	15	c	c
Hours worked per week (2.33)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	22	c	c
Full-time (35 or more hours)	103	39.4	37.5
Average hourly earnings (4.91***)			
$1.60 or less	38	47.1	49.1
$1.61-$2.40	51	27.8	26.2
$2.41 or more	36	55.4	55.9
Area of residence (2.67*)			
In SMSA, central city	64	46.3	45.6
In SMSA, not central city	18	c	c
Not in SMSA	43	32.3	27.3
Region of residence (0.86)			
South	83	37.3	36.4
West	11	c	c
Other	31	45.7	47.5

a Percentages are adjusted for the effects of all the explanatory variables shown in the table.

b Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.

c Percentages not shown where number of sample size is smaller than 25.

* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.

** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.

*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 8 Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)[a]

(Percentage distribution)

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Age		Number of children under 14 years		Relative 18 years or older	
		17-27	34-48	1	2 or more	No	Yes
Total number in sample	125	63	62	41	84	83	42
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	59	63	55	69	55	61	57
In child's home	31	21	45	20	37	25	45
Father	8	3	13	2	10	7	9
Older sibling	4	0	8	3	4	3	4
Other relative	12	13	10	15	10	3	31
Mother after school[c]	1	0	1	0	1	1	0
Combination of family members	8	5	12	0	12	10	2
Child cares for self	1	0	2	0	1	1	0
Outside child's home	28	42	10	49	18	36	11
Home of relative	24	35	10	46	14	31	10
Mother at work	4	7	0	4	4	5	2
Nonfamily sources of care	41	37	45	31	45	39	43
In child's home	10	4	19	6	12	9	13
Nonrelative	2	1	3	0	3	3	0
Relative and nonrelative	8	3	16	6	10	6	13
Outside child's home	29	34	23	23	32	29	30
Nonrelative	8	12	3	8	9	11	2
Day care center	21	21	20	15	24	18	28
Other	1	0	3	3	1	1	1

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 8 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Child 14-17 years old in household		Marital status		Highest grade completed			Hours worked per week	
		No	Yes	Married	Other	0-11	12	13-18	Full time	Part time
Total number in sample	125	87	38	77	48	68	42	15	103	22
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	b	100	b
Family sources of care	59	64	50	65	52	63	53	b	61	b
In child's home	31	25	46	37	25	33	23	b	31	b
Father	8	5	13	13	1	11	2	b	9	b
Older sibling	4	2	7	5	2	6	0	b	2	b
Other relative	12	11	12	8	15	8	10	b	12	b
Mother after school[c]	1	0	2	1	0	0	2	b	1	b
Combination of family members	8	6	13	9	6	7	10	b	6	b
Child cares for self	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	b	1	b
Outside child's home	28	38	4	29	27	29	30	b	30	b
Home of relative	24	33	4	23	26	24	30	b	29	b
Mother at work	4	5	0	6	1	6	0	b	2	b
Nonfamily sources of care	41	37	51	35	48	38	47	b	39	b
In child's home	10	5	24	13	7	12	8	b	9	b
Nonrelative	2	2	2	1	3	2	0	b	2	b
Relative and nonrelative	8	3	22	12	4	10	8	b	8	b
Outside child's home	29	32	22	20	40	25	38	b	29	b
Nonrelative	8	11	2	5	13	9	8	b	9	b
Day care center	21	21	20	16	27	15	30	b	20	b
Other	1	0	5	2	1	1	2	b	1	b

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 8 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Average hourly earnings			Area of residence			Region of residence		
		$1.60 or less	$1.61-$2.40	$2.41 or more	In SMSA central city	In SMSA not central city	Not in SMSA	South	West	Other
Total number in sample	125	38	51	36	64	18	43	83	11	31
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	b	100	100	b	100
Family sources of care	59	53	72	45	54	b	68	63	b	54
In child's home	31	27	38	25	30	b	34	36	b	24
Father	8	3	12	5	10	b	6	8	b	7
Older sibling	4	3	5	2	2	b	4	5	b	2
Other relative	12	7	14	13	9	b	10	13	b	7
Mother after school[c]	1	0	1	0	0	b	0	1	b	0
Combination of family members	8	11	7	5	7	b	14	10	b	5
Child cares for self	1	2	0	0	1	b	0	0	b	2
Outside child's home	28	26	34	20	24	b	34	27	b	31
Home of relative	24	26	27	17	21	b	26	22	b	31
Mother at work	4	0	7	3	3	b	8	5	b	0
Nonfamily sources of care	41	47	28	55	46	b	32	37	b	46
In child's home	10	18	6	8	6	b	17	14	b	5
Nonrelative	2	0	1	5	1	b	4	2	b	2
Relative and nonrelative	8	18	5	3	5	b	14	12	b	3
Outside child's home	29	26	22	46	37	b	15	21	b	41
Nonrelative	8	10	3	16	15	b	2	2	b	21
Day care center	21	16	19	30	22	b	13	19	b	20
Other	1	3	0	2	3	b	0	2	b	0

a Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables in the preceding MCA (Table 7) are excluded from the sample.

b Percentage distribution not shown where sample size is less than 25.

c Mother works only when child is in school.

Table 9 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)[b]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted percent	Adjusted[a] percent
Total or average (4.01***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.07	593	16.9	16.9
Age (1.48)			
17-27	31	35.8	24.9
34-48	562	15.9	16.5
Number of children under 14 years (0.02)			
1	313	15.9	17.1
2 or more	280	18.1	16.7
Relative 18 years or older (12.12***)			
No	467	19.7	19.6
Yes	126	6.5	6.8
Child 14-17 years old in household (22.17***)			
No	275	25.7	24.7
Yes	318	9.9	10.6
Marital status (2.41)			
Married	518	16.0	16.1
Other	75	23.3	23.0
Highest grade completed (0.99)			
0-11 years	160	17.9	17.7
12 years	305	14.4	15.1
13 or more years	128	21.7	20.3
Hours worked per week (4.75**)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	203	12.3	12.5
Full-time (35 or more hours)	390	19.4	19.3
Average hourly earnings (1.69)			
$1.60 or less	84	18.0	19.7
$1.61-$2.40	217	12.2	13.3
$2.41 or more	292	20.1	18.8
Area of residence (0.05)			
In SMSA, central city	123	18.8	17.7
In SMSA, not central city	239	17.1	17.0
Not in SMSA	231	15.7	16.5
Region of residence (0.09)			
South	177	18.8	17.1
West	109	20.4	18.1
Other	307	14.7	16.5

a Percentages are adjusted for the effects of all the explanatory variables shown in the table.

b Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.

* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.

** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.

*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 10 Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)[a]

(Percentage distribution)

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Age		Number of children under 14 years		Relative 18 years or older	
		17-27	34-48	1	2 or more	No	Yes
Total number in sample	593	31	562	313	280	467	126
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	83	64	84	84	82	80	94
In child's home	70	28	72	73	66	65	87
Father	13	7	14	11	16	14	11
Older sibling	18	0	19	15	21	15	29
Other relative	6	8	6	7	4	3	17
Mother after school[b]	11	8	11	10	13	11	12
Combination of family members	1	0	1	0	2	1	2
Child cares for self	21	5	21	30	10	22	17
Outside child's home	13	37	12	11	16	15	6
Home of relative	5	14	4	5	5	5	2
Mother at work	9	22	8	7	11	10	5
Nonfamily sources of care	17	36	16	16	18	20	7
In child's home	6	9	6	4	8	7	3
Nonrelative	5	8	5	3	7	6	1
Relative and nonrelative	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
Outside child's home	8	24	7	9	7	9	3
Nonrelative	6	23	5	6	6	8	0
Day care center	2	1	2	2	1	2	3
Other	3	4	3	4	3	4	1

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 10 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Child 14-17 years old in household		Marital status		Highest grade completed			Hours worked per week	
		No	Yes	Married	Other	0-11	12	13-18	Full time	Part time
Total number in sample	593	275	318	518	75	160	305	128	390	203
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	83	74	90	84	77	82	86	78	81	88
In child's home	70	56	81	70	67	70	70	69	68	73
Father	13	14	13	15	0	17	12	12	12	16
Older sibling	18	7	27	17	23	24	17	14	19	16
Other relative	6	8	4	5	13	4	7	4	6	5
Mother after school[b]	11	11	12	11	11	7	10	19	7	19
Combination of family members	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	0	0	3
Child cares for self	21	16	25	21	19	18	23	19	24	15
Outside child's home	13	18	9	14	10	12	15	10	12	15
Home of relative	5	7	3	5	4	4	6	3	6	3
Mother at work	9	11	7	9	6	8	10	6	7	12
Nonfamily sources of care	17	26	10	16	23	18	14	22	19	12
In child's home	6	10	3	5	10	3	5	12	7	4
Nonrelative	5	9	2	5	8	3	4	9	6	4
Relative and nonrelative	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	1
Outside child's home	8	12	5	7	12	10	7	8	10	4
Nonrelative	6	10	3	6	10	8	5	7	7	4
Day care center	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	3	1
Other	3	4	2	3	2	4	3	2	3	4

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 10 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Average hourly earnings			Area of residence			Region of residence		
		$1.60 or less	$1.61-$2.40	$2.41 or more	In SMSA central city	In SMSA not central city	Not in SMSA	South	West	Other
Total number in sample	593	84	217	292	123	239	231	177	109	307
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	83	82	88	80	81	83	84	81	80	85
In child's home	70	69	72	68	68	72	69	69	72	70
Father	13	12	14	14	9	15	14	8	10	18
Older sibling	18	25	19	15	20	20	17	14	15	21
Other relative	6	7	4	7	8	5	6	6	5	6
Mother after school[b]	11	10	15	9	13	12	9	15	15	8
Combination of family members	1	0	3	0	1	1	1	0	2	1
Child cares for self	21	16	18	24	18	18	25	26	25	16
Outside child's home	13	13	15	11	13	11	16	12	8	16
Home of relative	5	3	6	4	5	3	6	6	3	4
Mother at work	9	11	9	8	8	8	10	6	5	11
Nonfamily sources of care	17	18	12	20	19	17	16	19	20	15
In child's home	6	2	3	9	5	7	5	5	9	5
Nonrelative	5	2	2	8	5	6	4	5	7	4
Relative and nonrelative	1	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	2	1
Outside child's home	8	7	7	9	7	7	9	10	9	6
Nonrelative	6	5	5	7	6	6	6	7	8	5
Day care center	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	3	1	1
Other	3	9	2	2	6	3	1	3	2	4

a Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the preceding MCA (Table 9) are excluded from the sample.

b Mother works only when child is in school.

Table 11 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Proportions Who Relied on Nonfamily Sources of Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)[b]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristics	Number of respondents	Unadjusted percent	Adjusted[a] percent
Total or average (4.08***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.15	248	12.2	12.2
Age (13.14***)			
17-27	12	b	b
34-48	236	9.9	10.4
Number of children under 14 years (0.57)			
1	119	13.9	13.6
2 or more	129	10.4	10.7
Relative 18 years or older (0.75)			
No	146	14.1	13.7
Yes	102	9.6	10.3
Child 14-17 years old in household (9.65***)			
No	97	20.8	19.2
Yes	151	5.9	7.1
Marital status (1.41)			
Married	144	8.8	10.2
Other	104	16.8	14.8
Highest grade completed (0.64)			
0-11 years	142	8.2	11.0
12 years	71	19.7	15.1
13 or more years	35	8.2	9.6
Hours worked per week (0.47)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	45	9.6	9.7
Full-time (35 or more hours)	203	12.9	12.9
Average hourly earnings (4.35**)			
$1.60 or less	63	17.9	22.9
$1.61-$2.40	80	8.1	10.3
$2.41 or more	105	12.5	8.5
Area of residence (0.88)			
In SMSA, central city	135	11.8	11.8
In SMSA, not central city	44	11.0	8.1
Not in SMSA	69	13.9	15.9
Region of residence (10.36***)			
South	159	9.5	7.1
West	14	c	c
Other	75	12.4	15.8

a Percentages are adjusted for the effects of all the explanatory variables shown in the table.

b Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.

c Percentages not shown where number of sample size is smaller than 25.

* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.

** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.

*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 12 Child Care Arrangements, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)[a]

(Percentage distribution)

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Age		Number of children under 14 years		Relative 18 years or older	
		17-27	34-48	1	2 or more	No	Yes
Total number in sample	248	12	236	119	129	146	102
Total percent	100	b	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	88	b	90	86	90	86	90
In child's home	72	b	75	72	72	67	78
Father	12	b	13	9	15	13	10
Older sibling	25	b	27	20	31	25	24
Other relative	14	b	13	16	11	9	20
Mother after school[c]	6	b	6	9	4	5	8
Combination of family members	0	b	0	0	1	0	1
Child cares for self	15	b	16	19	10	15	15
Outside child's home	16	b	15	14	18	19	12
Home of relative	9	b	9	9	9	14	2
Mother at work	7	b	7	5	9	4	10
Nonfamily sources of care	12	b	10	14	10	14	10
In child's home	3	b	2	4	3	4	3
Nonrelative	2	b	1	1	3	3	0
Relative and nonrelative	2	b	1	4	0	1	3
Outside child's home	6	b	5	7	5	9	3
Nonrelative	5	b	4	6	4	6	3
Day care center	1	b	1	2	1	2	0
Other	3	b	3	3	3	2	4

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 12 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Child 14-17 years old in household		Marital status		Highest grade completed			Hours worked per week	
		No	Yes	Married	Other	0-11	12	13-18	Full time	Part time
Total number in sample	248	97	151	144	104	142	71	35	203	45
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Family sources of care	88	79	94	91	83	92	80	92	87	90
In child's home	72	54	85	72	71	75	68	70	73	70
Father	12	9	14	19	2	11	11	19	15	1
Older sibling	25	8	37	20	31	36	16	9	21	38
Other relative	14	17	12	7	22	11	17	17	17	1
Mother after school[c]	6	7	6	8	4	2	7	18	7	5
Combination of family members	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Child cares for self	15	13	17	17	11	15	18	8	12	24
Outside child's home	16	26	9	19	12	17	12	21	15	21
Home of relative	9	19	2	14	3	10	8	7	8	13
Mother at work	7	7	7	5	9	7	4	15	7	7
Nonfamily sources of care	12	21	6	9	17	8	20	8	13	10
In child's home	3	5	2	3	4	2	6	2	3	6
Nonrelative	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	2	0
Relative and nonrelative	2	3	1	1	3	1	4	0	1	6
Outside child's home	6	11	3	5	8	4	9	6	7	1
Nonrelative	5	10	1	4	6	3	8	4	6	1
Day care center	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	0
Other	3	5	1	2	5	2	5	0	3	2

(Table continued on next page.)

Table 12 -- Continued

Child care arrangements	Total or average	Average hourly earnings			Area of residence			Region of residence		
		$1.60 or less	$1.61-$2.40	$2.41 or more	In SMSA central city	In SMSA not central city	Not in SMSA	South	West	Other
Total number in sample	248	63	80	105	135	44	69	159	14	75
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	b	100
Family sources of care	88	82	92	88	83	89	86	91	b	88
In child's home	72	70	73	72	67	81	76	74	b	71
Father	12	4	11	17	12	16	9	7	b	18
Older sibling	25	37	23	21	24	28	26	28	b	21
Other relative	14	14	13	14	11	20	16	15	b	14
Mother after school[c]	6	1	6	9	3	8	11	8	b	4
Combination of family members	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	b	0
Child cares for self	15	14	20	12	17	8	15	15	b	15
Outside child's home	16	12	19	15	21	8	10	17	b	17
Home of relative	9	3	13	9	10	8	8	11	b	8
Mother at work	7	9	6	6	11	0	2	6	b	9
Nonfamily sources of care	12	18	8	13	12	11	14	10	b	12
In child's home	3	10	0	3	3	0	7	4	b	2
Nonrelative	2	3	0	2	2	0	1	1	b	2
Relative and nonrelative	2	7	0	1	1	0	6	3	b	0
Outside child's home	6	7	1	9	6	7	6	5	b	7
Nonrelative	5	7	1	7	4	6	6	4	b	6
Day care center	1	0	0	3	2	2	0	1	b	1
Other	3	1	7	1	4	4	1	1	b	4

a Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the preceding MCA (Table 11) are excluded from the sample.

b Percentage distribution not shown where sample size is less than 25.

c Mother works only when child is in school.

Table 13 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Expenditures[b] for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child under 3 years of age)[c]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted expenditure[b]	Adjusted[a] expenditure[b]
Total or average (3.25***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.13	226	$.38	$.38
Age (3.66*)			
17-27	197	.40	.41
34-48	29	.26	.19
Number of children under 14 years (4.48**)			
1	128	.33	.31
2 or more	98	.45	.48
Marital status (0.25)			
Married	196	.40	.39
Other	30	.28	.34
Highest grade completed (0.96)			
0-11 years	50	.31	.37
12 years	124	.35	.35
13 or more years	52	.53	.48
Hours worked per week (5.39**)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	72	.43	.51
Full-time (35 or more hours)	154	.36	.32
Average hourly earnings (2.60*)			
$1.60 or less	[illegible]	.2[illegible]	.22
$1.61-$2.40	92	.29	.35
$2.41 or more	[illegible]0	.52	.47
Area of residence (2.30*)			
In SMSA, central city	60	.29	.26
In SMSA, not central city	76	.45	.47
Not in SMSA	90	.39	.39
Region of residence (1.54)			
South	82	.46	.48
West	39	.35	.29
Other	105	.35	.36
Type of child care (8.39***)			
Care by family member in child's home	56	.07	.07
Care by family member outside child's home	5[illegible]	.38	.40
Nonfamily care outside child's home	89	.53	.53
Nonfamily care in child's home	29	.59	.55

a Expenditures are adjusted for the effects of all explanatory variables shown in table.
b Average expenditure for child care per hour that the woman worked.
c Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.
* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.
** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.
*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 14 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Expenditures[b] for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child under 3 years of age)[c]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted expenditure[b]	Adjusted[a] expenditure[b]
Total or average (1.71**)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.05	207	$.37	$.37
Age (2.29)			
17-27	174	.40	.45
34-48	33	.23	.00
Number of children under 14 years (0.57)			
1	88	.26	.27
2 or more	119	.46	.45
Marital status (3.94**)			
Married	125	.27	.18
Other	82	.54	.68
Highest grade completed (0.12)			
0-11 years	84	.51	.39
12 years	92	.24	.33
13 or more years	31	.48	.50
Hours worked per week (1.10)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	46	.28	.14
Full-time (35 or more hours)	161	.40	.44
Average hourly earnings (1.54)			
$1.60 or less	62	.62	.74
$1.61-$2.40	100	.25	.22
$2.41 or more	45	.41	.34
Area of residence (2.35*)			
In SMSA, central city	104	.31	.15
In SMSA, not central city	39	.29	.38
Not in SMSA	64	.53	.75
Region of residence (0.06)			
South	143	.38	.35
West	13	d	d
Other	51	.39	.45
Type of child care (6.94***)			
Care by family member in child's home	80	.16	.09
Care by family member outside child's home	63	.20	.14
Nonfamily care outside child's home	48	.36	.45
Nonfamily care in child's home	16	d	d

a Expenditures are adjusted for effects of all explanatory variables shown in table.
b Average expenditure for child care per hour that the woman worked.
c Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.
d Expenditures are not shown where sample size is less than 25.
* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.
** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.
*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 15 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Expenditures[b] for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)[c]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted expenditure[b]	Adjusted[a] expenditure[b]
Total or average (8.75***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = (0.36)	210	$.26	$.26
Age (0.01)			
17-27	106	.27	.26
34-48	104	.25	.27
Number of children under 14 years (0.44)			
1	79	.31	.25
2 or more	131	.24	.27
Marital status (2.86*)			
Married	171	.24	.25
Other	39	.35	.32
Highest grade completed (0.29)			
0-11 years	60	.22	.28
12 years	116	.27	.26
13 or more years	34	.30	.26
Hours worked per week (0.38)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	66	.24	.25
Full-time (35 or more hours)	144	.27	.27
Average hourly earnings (5.80***)			
$1.60 or less	22	d	d
$1.61-$2.40	88	.22	.26
$2.41 or more	100	.33	.30
Area of residence (0.32)			
In SMSA, central city	49	.27	.27
In SMSA, not central city	68	.28	.28
Not in SMSA	93	.25	.25
Region of residence (0.96)			
South	71	.29	.29
West	46	.26	.24
Other	93	.25	.26
Type of child care (35.33***)			
Care by family member in child's home	74	.07	.08
Care by family member outside child's home	31	.19	.21
Nonfamily care outside child's home	78	.40	.40
Nonfamily care in child's home	27	.47	.46

a Expenditures are adjusted for effects of all explanatory variables shown in table.
b Average expenditure for child care per hour that the woman worked.
c Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.
d Expenditures are not shown where sample size is less than 25.
* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.
** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.
*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 16 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Expenditures[b] for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child 3 to 5 years of age)[c]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted expenditure[b]	Adjusted[a] expenditure[b]
Total or average (1.03)			
$R^2 = 0.004$	125	$.28	$.28
Age (1.37)			
17-27	63	.38	.38
34-48	62	.15	.15
Number of children under 14 years (1.09)			
1	41	.20	.14
2 or more	84	.32	.35
Marital status (2.92*)			
Married	77	.14	.13
Other	48	.45	.46
Highest grade completed (0.29)			
0-11 years	68	.31	.31
12 years	42	.21	.19
13 or more years	15	d	d
Hours worked per week (0.04)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	22	d	d
Full-time (35 or more hours)	103	.28	.29
Average hourly earnings (2.13)			
$1.60 or less	38	.13	.06
$1.61-$2.40	51	.39	.50
$2.41 or more	36	.26	.16
Area of residence (2.41*)			
In SMSA, central city	64	.39	.48
In SMSA, not central city	18	d	d
Not in SMSA	43	.19	.20
Region of residence (1.46)			
South	83	.33	.40
West	11	d	d
Other	31	.21	.04
Type of child care (1.69)			
Care by family member in child's home	43	.07	.04
Care by family member outside child's home	34	.19	.19
Nonfamily care outside child's home	35	.54	.53
Nonfamily care in child's home	13	d	d

a Expenditures are adjusted for effects of all explanatory variables shown in table.
b Average expenditure for child care per hour that the woman worked.
c Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.
d Expenditures not shown where sample size is less than 25.
* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.
** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.
*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 17 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Expenditures[b] for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(White women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)[c]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted expenditure[b]	Adjusted[a] expenditure[b]
Total or average (25.31***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = (0.38)	593	$.06	$.06
Age (0.91)			
17-27	31	.09	.03
34-48	562	.06	.06
Number of children under 14 years (0.00)			
1	313	.05	.06
2 or more	280	.07	.06
Marital status (2.20)			
Married	518	.05	.05
Other	75	.10	.08
Highest grade completed (0.08)			
0-11 years	160	.04	.05
12 years	305	.05	.06
13 or more years	128	.10	.06
Hours worked per week (1.70)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	203	.03	.05
Full-time (35 or more hours)	390	.08	.07
Average hourly earnings (2.21)			
$1.60 or less	84	.02	.04
$1.61-$2.40	217	.03	.05
$2.41 or more	292	.09	.07
Area of residence (1.94)			
In SMSA, central city	123	.05	.04
In SMSA, not central city	239	.08	.07
Not in SMSA	231	.05	.05
Region of residence (2.27)			
South	177	.07	.07
West	109	.10	.08
Other	307	.04	.05
Type of child care (113.47***)			
Care by family member in child's home	413	.00	.00
Care by family member outside child's home	77	.06	.07
Nonfamily care outside child's home	65	.17	.17
Nonfamily care in child's home	38	.50	.49

a Expenditures are adjusted for effects of all explanatory variables shown in table.

b Average expenditure for child care per hour that the woman worked.

c Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.

* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.

** Significant at $\alpha < .05$.

*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 18 Unadjusted and Adjusted[a] Expenditures[b] for Child Care, by Socioeconomic and Demographic Characteristics, 1971

(Black women with youngest child 6 to 13 years of age)[c]

MCA results (F-ratios in parentheses)

Characteristic	Number of respondents	Unadjusted expenditure[b]	Adjusted[a] expenditure[b]
Total or average (2.59***)			
$\bar{R}^2$ = 0.09	248	$.04	$.04
Age (0.87)			
17-27	12	d	d
34-48	236	.03	.03
Number of children under 14 years (0.14)			
1	119	.04	.03
2 or more	129	.03	.04
Marital status (0.38)			
Married	144	.04	.04
Other	104	.03	.03
Highest grade completed (0.75)			
0-11 years	142	.02	.03
12 years	71	.04	.03
13 or more years	35	.08	.06
Hours worked per week (1.71)			
Part-time (1-34 hours)	45	.00	.02
Full-time (35 or more hours)	203	.04	.04
Average hourly earnings (4.50**)			
$1.60 or less	63	.03	.02
$1.61-$2.40	80	.01	.01
$2.41 or more	105	.06	.06
Area of residence (0.99)			
In SMSA, central city	135	.04	.04
In SMSA, not central city	44	.01	.01
Not in SMSA	69	.03	.04
Region of residence (0.64)			
South	159	.03	.04
West	14	d	d
Other	75	.04	.03
Type of child care (7.24***)			
Care by family member in child's home	179	.02	.02
Care by family member outside child's home	37	.02	.02
Nonfamily care outside child's home	24	d	d
Nonfamily care in child's home	8	d	d

a Expenditures are adjusted for effects of all explanatory variables shown in table.

b Average expenditure for child care per hour that the woman worked.

c Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the MCA are excluded from the sample.

d Expenditures not shown where sample size is less than 25.

* Significant at $\alpha \leq .10$.

** Significant at $\alpha \leq .05$.

*** Significant at $\alpha \leq .01$.

Table 19 Preference for an Alternative Form of Child Care, by Race and Age of Youngest Child, 1971[a]

Age of youngest child	Number of respondents	With preference for alternative (%)	Alternative means preferred			
			Care by family member in home (%)	Care by family member outside home (%)	Nonfamily care outside home (%)	Nonfamily care in home (%)
WHITES						
Less than 3	226	16	4	0	5	8
3 to 5	210	13	2	1	6	5
6 to 13	593	7	2	0	1	3
BLACKS						
Less than 3	207	18	2	2	11	3
3 to 5	125	16	4	0	9	3
6 to 13	248	5	1	0	2	2

a Universe restricted to women who were employed wage and salary workers in the 1971 survey week. Respondents who lack information on any of the variables used in the preceding MCA's (Tables 13 through 18) are excluded from the sample.

CE 010 523